

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 remain in the application and claim 1 has been amended hereby.

Replacement sheets for Figs. 1 and 2 are submitted herewith as Exhibit A labeling them as --(Prior Art)--, as requested in the Office Action.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over the so-called admitted prior art in view of Brito.

Features of the present invention are an earpad (5 in Fig. 4) including a removable facing (10 in Fig. 4) covering a cushion (9 in Fig. 4). A housing (4 in Fig. 4) is formed with a groove-shaped fitting portion (4a in Fig. 4) for holding a portion of the removable facing (12b in Fig. 4), thereby attaching the earpad to the housing via the removable facing. Further, the earpad is detachable from the housing and the removable facing is detachable from the cushion. See Fig. 6 of the present application, for example.

The Office Action concedes that the so-called admitted prior art fails to show or suggest that the facing is detachable from the cushion of the earpad and cites Brito as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that Brito fails to show or suggest a removable facing being detachable from the cushion of the earpad. The earpad of Brito is a cushion encased by a covering forming a unitary earpad that is detachably mounted using a variety of methods to a pre-existing handset. See Fig.

10, and col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 24 of Brito.

Nowhere in Brito is shown or suggested that the covering is replaceable or removable from the cushion. Brito is merely teaching that the covering can be made of an easily cleaned or disposable material suggesting that the entire earpad can be cleaned or disposed.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Brito fails to show or suggest a housing formed with a groove-shaped fitting portion for holding a portion of the removable facing so as to attach the earpad via the removable housing. Brito's earpads are formed to be attached to existing handsets using a variety of attachment methods, therefore, no groove-shaped fitting portion in the headset for removably attaching an earpad is taught by Brito.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and claim 2 depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over the so-called admitted prior art in view of Brito.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

6640/63437

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc